

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/234,695	01/21/1999	ANDRE-ROGER HENRY DELLEVI	5728		
7:	590 10/10/2003		EXAMINER		
IVAR M KAARDAL			VAN DOREN, BETH		
3500 SOUTH I	ASSOCIATES,PC. FIRST AVE	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
CIRCLE-SUITE 250			3623	•	
SIOUX FALLS, SD 571055807			DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003	DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
* Advisory Action	09/234,695	DELLEVI ET AL.	
بر المرابع الم	Examiner	Art Unit	
,	Beth Van Doren	3623	\wedge
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 02 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ation. A proper reply n places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of ti (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ci	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final (on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	,	,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	3 .
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	enewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>17</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. ☐ Other:			_
		TARIQ R. HAPIZ /ISORY PATENT EXAN INOLOGY CENTER 36	

Application/Control Tamber: 09/234,695

Art Unit: 3623

Advisory Action

This Advisory Action is in response to the communications received on 10/02/03. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance for at least the reason stated below.

Applicant argues that "Visual Rota from CDT" (www.btinternet.com/vrota) does not teach or suggest distinguishing between types of jobs or qualifications to perform different types of jobs, instead the shifts and the employees are treated as fungible or equally interchangeable.

In response to this argument, Examiner points out that nothing in claim 17 recites the term "types of jobs". The invention claimed in claim 17 recites that a first employee sets forth a conditional offer to trade his/her first shift for another employee's second shift, this offer is displayed to other employees, a conditional acceptance is received from a second employee to trade his/her second shift for the first shift of the first employee, and confirming or rejecting the trade of the first and second employees' shifts once the criteria is verified (i.e. checking training data of the second employee and the training requirements of the work area function to be performed in the first shift, checking the time between receipt of the conditional acceptance and the occurrence of the first and second shifts to verify the length is not less than a minimum time period). Once the trade is confirmed, a notification about the work area function of the first shift and the training data of the second employee is displayed to the second employee, a confirmation of the trade is indicated to the first employee, and access top information about the trade is restricted. Therefore, the claim does not discuss job type, only checking the training data

*Art Unit: 3623

of an employee and the training requirements of the work area function of the shift to be given to said employee.

Examiner reminds the Applicant that the Examiner relied upon Donnelly et al. and not "Visual Rota from CDT" to teach the limitations regarding checking training data of the second employee and the training requirements of the work area function.

Donnelly et al. teaches this limitation in at least column 7, lines 43-45, column 9, lines 38-41, column 10, lines 10-21, column 11, lines 18-24 and 40-52, column 13, lines 35-45, column 17, lines 7-13, 25-40, and 55-59, column 22, lines 45-55, column 25, lines 12-26, column 26, lines 1-7, 30-50, and 60-65, wherein the training data associated with the second employee is stored and checked when the second employee is being assigned to a work area function with certain requirements of skill level/training level. Examiner maintains that "Visual Rota from CDT" teaches the aspects upon which it was relied.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

1113.

bvď

October 9, 2003

TARIO R. HAPIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXPANSED
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 5800